



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/076,181

02/12/2002

Hal Hildebrand

SSL1P002/SS-005

8962

22830

7590

10/20/2006

CARR & FERRELL LLP
2200 GENG ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/076,181

Applicant(s)

HILDEBRAND ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin Bates

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2-27.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on August 14, 2006.

The Information Disclosure Statement has been received on February 27, 2006 and has been considered.

Claims 1-9 have been cancelled.

Claims 10 – 21 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 10-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Misra (5757920)

Regarding claims 10, 18 and 21, Misra teaches a method for providing access management through use of a plurality of server machines associated with different locations (Column 4, lines 31 – 39), said method comprising the acts of:

(a) authenticating a user with a first server machine of the plurality of server machines with respect to a prior access request;

(b) subsequently receiving a current access request to access a secured item via a second server machine of the plurality of server machines;

(c) reconfiguring the first server machine to prevent further access by the user to secured items via the first server machine (Column 7, lines 53 – 65); and

(d) reconfiguring the second server machine to permit access by the user to at least the secured item via the second server machine (Column 5, lines 10 – 21, wherein the first server machine is the home domain, and the second machine is a different domain).

Regarding claim 11, Misra teaches a method as recited in claim 10, wherein said authenticating (a) authenticates both the user and a client machine being used by the user (Column 4, line 66 – Column 5, line 9).

Regarding claim 12, Misra teaches a method as recited in claim 10, wherein the first server machine and the second server machine are access points for the user to gain access to secured items (Column 5, lines 10 – 14).

Regarding claim 13, Misra teaches a method as recited in claim 10, wherein when the user is at a first location, the user interacts over a network with the first server machine using a first client machine at the first location, and wherein when the user is at a second location, the user interacts over a network with the second server machine using a second client machine at the second location (Column 5, lines 10 – 21).

Regarding claims 14 and 20, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 13 and 18, wherein said method further comprises at least the acts of: (f) determining, prior to said reconfiguring (c) or (d), whether the user is permitted to gain access from a second location to secured items via the second server machine (Column 5, lines 10 – 16).

Regarding claim 15, Misra teaches a method as recited in claim 13, wherein said authenticating (a) of the user occurs while the user is at a first location, and wherein said receiving (a) of the access request to access the secured item from the user occurs while the user is at a second location (Column 5, lines 10 – 21, wherein the system has a home location with maintains the credentials and authorization, which is then distributed through the server system).

Regarding claim 16, Misra teaches a method as recited in claim 16, wherein said method further comprises at least the acts of: (e) determining permitted locations from which the user is permitted to gain access to secured documents; (f) determining, prior to said reconfiguring (c) or (d), whether the second location is one of the permitted locations for the user; and (g) bypassing said reconfiguring (c) or (d) when said determining (f) determines that the second location is not one of the permitted locations for the user (Column 5, lines 10 – 21).

Regarding claims 17 and 19, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 16 and 18, wherein when the user is at the first location, the user interacts over a network with the first server machine using a first client machine at the first location, and wherein when the user is at the second location, the user interacts over a network with the second server machine using a second client machine at the second location (Column 3, line 67 – Column 4, line 7; Column 4, line 66 – Column 5, line 2; Column 5, lines 10 – 19, wherein the user and machine locations are roaming in the system and which ever domain the user/machine combination logs in at it connects to that domains controller which is the same location as the machine location).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the reference, Misra, does not teach preventing access to a first server, reconfiguring either the first or second server, or reconfiguring based on the second request. The examiner disagrees, in the claim language it is unclear that the reconfiguring the first and second server machine is based on subsequently receiving an access request to the second machine. The claim in its broadest possible terms can be read as being able to receive a second request for a second for a second server machine, which is shown in the reference on Column 5, lines 16 – 21, where the user can get access to any server machine after being authorized on a first server machine. The reference also teaches the ability to prevent access to the first server machine as seen in Column 7, lines 56 – 58, which shows a change in the authorization which can be determined as a change in configuration. Also the reference shows a change in the second server machine in Column 5, lines 16 – 21, where allowing access to the first domain changes the behavior, thus configuration of the second domain.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KB

KB
October 14, 2006


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER